

Remarks/Arguments

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application in view of the present amendments and following remarks.

Claims 1-20, 26-30, and 34 – 47 are pending; Claims 1, 10, 20, and 34 are amended; and Claims 44 – 47 are added by the present amendment. Support for changes to the claims and new claims are found at least in paragraphs 24 and 37. Thus, no new matter is added.

The outstanding Official Action rejected Claims 1, 10, 34, 36, 38, and 42 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2003/0167315 to *Chowdhry et al.* (hereinafter “*Chowdhry*”); and rejected Claims 2 – 9, 11 – 20, 26 – 30, 35, 37, 39 – 41, and 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over *Chowdhry* and U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2002/0023230 to *Bolnick et al.* (hereinafter “*Bolnick*”).

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the courtesy of an interview between Applicants’ representatives and the Examiner on April 15, 2009. During the interview, Applicant’s representatives discussed the differences between Applicant’s Claim 1 and the login procedure of *Chowdhry*. Particularly, Applicants representatives explained that users of *Chowdhry* who belonged to a default group received a message to contact their administrator. The Examiner indicated that the outstanding Official Action considered the message of *Chowdhry* as an electronic information product. Applicants further proposed claim amendments. The Examiner looked favorably to these amendments, but indicated that further consideration may be required. The changes to the claims discussed with the Examiner are incorporated herein, and arguments presented during the interview are reiterated below.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)

The outstanding Official Action rejected Claims 1, 10, 34, 36, 38, and 42 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a).

Claim 1 is directed to an Internet delivery method delivering electronic information products to a plurality of users via the Internet. The method recites, *inter alia*,

delivering, upon determination that the authenticated user is said type of user, a system display page formatted in said custom display format, said system display page configured to receive search criteria for one or more electronic information products;

delivering, upon determination that the authenticated user is not said specific type of user, the system display page formatted in said default display page format and *configured to receive the search criteria for the one or more electronic information products*. (Emphasis added).

Regarding the applied references, *Chowdhry* describes a system for generating websites using portlets.¹ Fig. 36 illustrates an example user page for users who belong to a user group. *Chowdhry* describes this user page as “a multi-page portal interface … where the interface has a number of tabs … and displays a single page at a time.”² *Chowdhry* describes that a user logs into the system to access the user page of *Chowdhry*, but if the user “does not belong to a user group, … [the user is] a member of … [a] default group [called] ‘guest.’”³ *Chowdhry* further describes that these “guest group members are … *unable to do anything* and after logging in *simply receive a message* that they are part of the guest group and must see their administrator.”⁴

Claim 1 is distinguishable over *Chowdhry* as the applied reference fails to disclose or suggest “delivering, upon determination that *the authenticated user is not said specific type of user*, the system display page formatted in said default display page format and configured to

¹ See *Chowdhry* at Paragraph 6.

² See *Chowdhry* at Paragraph 260. As described in paragraph 112 of *Chowdhry*, user pages created by the system in *Chowdhry* include the WERCLETS™.

³ See *Chowdhry* at Paragraph 257.

⁴ See *Chowdhry* at Paragraph 257. (Emphasis added).

receive the search criteria for the one or more electronic information products.” As discussed above, *Chowdhry* describes that users in the default “guest” group merely receive a message notifying the “guest” users to see their administrator. That is, if the users of *Chowdhry* do not belong to a particular user group, then no system display page “configured to *receive the search criteria for the one or more electronic information products*” is delivered, as recited in amended Claim 1. (Emphasis added).

Further, Fig. 25 of *Chowdhry* illustrates an example user page with a symbol lookup feature.⁵ However, as discussed above, user pages of *Chowdhry* are only accessible upon logging into the system of *Chowdhry*. Accordingly, the symbol lookup feature illustrated in Fig. 25 of *Chowdhry* is not available to users who belong to a default group. Thus, the user page in Fig. 25 of *Chowdhry* is not a “system display page formatted in said default display page format and configured to *receive the search criteria for the one or more electronic information products*,” as recited in amended Claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that *Chowdhry* fails to disclose or suggest all the features of Claim 1 as amended. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 1, and claims depending therefrom, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) be withdrawn.

Claim 10 is amended to recite features analogous to Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that *Chowdhry* fails to disclose or suggest all the features of Claim 10 as amended. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 10, and claims depending therefrom, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) be withdrawn.

Claim 34 is amended to recite features analogous to Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that *Chowdhry* fails to disclose or suggest all the features of Claim 34 as amended.

⁵ See *Chowdhry* at Paragraph 204.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 34, and claims depending therefrom, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The outstanding Official Action rejected Claims 2 – 9, 11 – 20, 26 – 30, 35, 37, 39 – 41, and 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over *Chowdhry* and *Bolnick*.

As discussed above, *Chowdhry* fails to disclose or suggest all the feature of amended Claims 1, from which Claims 2 – 9 depend. Applicants have considered *Bolnick* and submit that *Bolnick* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Chowdhry*.

As discussed above, *Chowdhry* fails to disclose or suggest all the feature of amended Claim 10, from which Claims 11 – 19 depend. Applicants have considered *Bolnick* and submit that *Bolnick* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Chowdhry*.

Claim 20 is amended to recite features analogous to Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that *Chowdhry* and *Bolnick* fail to disclose or suggest all the features of Claim 20.

As discussed above, *Chowdhry* fails to disclose or suggest all the feature of amended Claim 34, from which Claims 35, 37, and 39-41 depend. Applicants have considered *Bolnick* and submit that *Bolnick* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Chowdhry*.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that there is no *prima facie* case of obviousness for Claims 2 – 9, 11 – 19, and 35, 37, and 39-41 . Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

New Claims

New Claim 44 recites that “wherein the electronic information product formatted in the default display format is configured to receive at least one response from the user.” New

Claims 45 – 47 recite features analogous to new Claim 44. As discussed above, if the users of *Chowdhry* do not belong to any particular group, they are “*unable to do anything* and after logging in *simply receive a message* that they are part of the guest group and must see their administrator.”⁶ *Chowdhry* neither discloses nor suggests that the message of *Chowdhry* is “configured to receive at least one response from the user,” as recited in new Claim 44 and similarly recited in new Claims 45 – 47. Applicants have considered *Bolnick* and submit that *Chowdhry* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Bolnick*. Accordingly, Applicants submit that new Claims 44 – 47 are patentable over *Chowdhry* and *Bolnick*.

Conclusion

Consequently, in view of the present response and amendments, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in a condition for formal allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Request for a Telephone Interview

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-607-3500.

Respectfully submitted,

FAEGRE & BENSON LLP

By: /Soumya Panda/
Soumya (Soum) P. Panda
Reg. No. 60,447
303.607.3731
Customer No.: 35657

Dated: May 18, 2009
fb.us.4002756.01

⁶ See *Chowdhry* at Paragraph 257. (Emphasis added).